## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

In re:

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

City of Detroit, Michigan Debtor. Honorable Thomas J. Tucker

Chapter 9

RODRICK SINER'S RESPONSE TO THE GETY OF DETROIT'S MOTION FOR THE ENTRY FOR AN ORDER (I) ENFORCING THE PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT INJUNCTION AND (II)
REQUIRING RODRICK SINER TO DISHESS WITH PREJUDICE HIS DISTRICT COERT

Rodrick Siner, pro-se acting without the benefit of counsel, does not consent to the relief sought in the motion filed by attorneys for the city of Detroit, and respectfully states as follows:

Rodrick Siner is an immate who has been incorrected since April 3, 2013, who contends the city of Detroits bankruptcy does not automatically relieves the city of Detroit from all liabilities and claims filed against the city

Furthermore, Mr. Siner's sufferings have been continuous and on going. On April 13, 2010 an arrest warrant was issued for Mr. Siner. On April 5, 2012, Mr. Siner was arrested on the warrant. The case was dismissed on October 4, 2012. Mr. Siner, was held in Michigan en other charges not related to this incidents on August 18, 2019, mr. siner was extradited to Alabama in which he had a Parole Revocation Heaving on October 13, 2015, in which his parole was revoked based on the warrant that was issue for Mr. siner by the city of Detroit on April 13, 2010. Mr. Siner, is in prison to this very day because of the action of Officers of the city of Detroit. Mr. siner, contends the City of bankruptcy could not possibly cover future events, as Mr. siner's Parole Revocation Hearing occurred on october 13, 2015, in which Mr. siner couldn't have foreseen the outcome of that hearing prior to October 13, 2015. In which Mr. siner was violated on false information relayed to his parole officer, by officers of the City of Detroit.

Mr. Siner, contends although the incidents of his claim began on April 13, 2010, he didn't file his claim until after his parale revolation hearing. Therefore, at the time of the city of Detroit's bankruptcy, Mr. Siner was still going through the process.

Mr. Siner, is still suffering from the actions of the city of Detroit's Police Officers to this very day

Mr. Siner, contends just because the city of Detroit filed bankruptcy, bankruptcy laws doesn't mean an entity cannot be held accountable for its actions

It also should be noted that Mr. Siner

did not receive a copy of city of Detroit's

Motion until April 21, 2016, in which I notice

I was to have within 14 days to file a

response. However, the attorney for the City

of Detroit failed to put a date on the

certificate of Service as to when the motion

was actually mailed to Mrisiner.

Rodrick Smer 215956 28779 Nick Davis Rd Harvest, Al 35749

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certifies that on April 22, 2016, I mail a Copy of Rodrick Siner's Response to the City of Detroit's Motion for the Entry of an Order (I) Enfering The Plan of Adjustment Injunction and (II) Requiring Rodrick Siner to Dismiss With Prejudice His District Court Lawsuit, first class mail!

Marc N. Swanson 150 West Jefferson, Suite 2500 Detroit, Michigan 48226 United States Bankruptay Court
211 W. Fort St., Suite 1900
Detroit, Michigan 48226

13-53846-tjt Doc 11175 Filed 05/17/16 Entered \$5/17/16 12:31:46 Page 4 of 8

Rodrick Siner 215956 28779 Nick Davis Rd Harvest, AL 35749

May 10, 2016

Office of the Clerk of Court 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2100 Detroit, MI 48226-3211



Re: CASE No 13-53846, City of Detroit's Motion for an order (I) enforcing the plan of adjustment injunction and (II) Requiring Rodrick Siner to dismiss with prejudice his district court lawsuiti

Dear clerk,

I received a motion from the

I received a motion from the

City of Detroit's attorney; that stated I

have 14 days to respond to the motion,

attached is a partial copy marked exhibit

"A"

That is why I filed the response motion into this court. I have a pending lawsuit against the City of Detroit Case No. 2:15-cv-13532. It is my understanding

from the Motion I received from the City of Detroit's attorney, they are trying to have the United States Bankruptcy Court Eastern District of Michigan Southern Division, enter an order forcing the dismissal of my pending lawsuit against the city of Detroit.

Sincerely, Roduich Sines

Exhibit A"

## EXHIBIT 2 – NOTICE

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

In re:

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

City of Detroit, Michigan,

Honorable Thomas J. Tucker

Debtor.

Chapter 9

NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO CITY OF DETROIT'S MOTION FOR THE ENTRY OF AN ORDER (I) ENFORCING THE PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT INJUNCTION AND (II) REQUIRING RODRICK SINER TO DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE HIS DISTRICT COURT LAWSUIT

The City of Detroit has filed its Motion for the Entry of an Order (I) Enforcing the Plan of Adjustment Injunction and (II) Requiring Rodrick Siner to Dismiss with Prejudice His District Court Lawsuit.

Your rights may be affected. You should read these papers carefully and discuss them with your attorney.

If you do not want the Court to enter an Order granting the City of Detroit's Motion for the Entry of an Order (I) Enforcing the Plan of Adjustment Injunction and (II) Requiring Rodrick Siner to Dismiss with Prejudice His District Court Lawsuit, within 14 days, you or your attorney must:

1. File with the court a written response or an answer, explaining your position at:<sup>1</sup>

United States Bankruptcy Court 211 W. Fort St., Suite 1900 Detroit, Michigan 48226

If you mail your response to the court for filing, you must mail it early enough so that the court will **receive** it on or before the date stated above. You must also mail a copy to:

Miller, Canfield, Paddock & Stone, PLC Attn: Marc N. Swanson 150 West Jefferson, Suite 2500 Detroit, Michigan 48226

2. If a response or answer is timely filed and served, the clerk will schedule a hearing on the motion and you will be served with a notice of the date, time, and location of that hearing.

If you or your attorney do not take these steps, the court may decide that you do not oppose the relief sought in the motion or objection and may enter an order granting that relief.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Response or answer must comply with F. R. Civ. P. 8(b), (c) and (e).